## Registration of Co-operative Societies

389 Sri G. CHANDRAKANTH (Bidar).—

Will the Minister for Development be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the number of Co-operative Societies registered so far in Bidar District during the year 1967;

(*b*) in how many of them audit has been conducted (up-to-date information may be furnished) ;

(*c*) how many of them are functioning and how many of them have become defunct ?

Sri P. M. NADGOUDA (Minister for Development).—

(*a*) 484.

(*b*) 448.

(*c*) (i) 23 under liquidation.
(ii) 61 Weak and dormant.

## Permission to put held-over Question after Question Hour

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, there is one held-over question on the agenda. I may be permitted to put that question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question hour is over and I cannot permit any question now. From tomorrow onwards the Hon'ble Members may co-operate with the Chair to see that all the questions are taken up. Let the Hon'ble Members consider to-day's position as a lesson for future and co-operate with the Chair.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Kindly look at the agenda, Sir. It is a separate question which was held-over by the the Chair yesterday.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may please resume his seat.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—I have a point of order, Sir. You have just now said that since the time is over, all the remaining questions have lapsed. But the held-over question, that has been included in the list of business, cannot be treated as lapsed. It was held-over because of the lapse on the part of the treasury benches. I do not think that there is any right on your part to say that since the Question Hour is over, the held-over question also has lapsed. You have got to see that the question is permitted to-day or else you will be denying an opportunity to the member. It is a wrong procedure and is opposed to the rules of procedure.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the Hon'ble Mr. Krishnan. He says that the question was held over by the Chair. All questions are put for

replies and it is expected that all questions are replied provided members co-operate with the Chair and stick to the time. But when the Question Hour is over, I think even a question which has been held-over by the order of the Chair cannot be put for want of time and that held-over question also will be treated as unstarred question.

**Government's responsibility to answer questions admitted by hon'ble Speaker.**

MR. SPEAKER.—Now the hon'ble member Sri Nagappa may state his point of order.

SRI M. NAGAPPA.—Sir, my point of order is that as per the printed list of starred questions and answers the Hon'ble Speaker was pleased to allow the question of Mr. Krishnan on page 10, *i.e.*, Question No. 184 wherein clause (d) was also admitted by the Hon'ble Speaker. When once the Speaker has admitted a question, it becomes the prestige and the order of the Speaker. Every letter and the order of the Speaker has to be complied with by the Minister in letter and spirit. They cannot say that it would not be in public interest to disclose this information. If that is so, they should approach the Hon'ble Speaker and see that such question is not admitted. But when once a question is admitted by the Hon ble Speaker it is the bounden duty of the Government to answer almost all questions that are admitted. So in support of my view I am quoting one ruling of the Andhra Pradesh Assembly which is as follows :—

> "112. Questions : When a question is allowed by the Speaker every portion of it has to be answered by the Government.
>
> On the 26th February 1960, question No. 1492 pertaining to the taking over of the Harijan hostels came before the House. In reply to clause (c) of the question it was stated 'it will not be in public interest to give the information and to place it on the Table of the House as it is an administrative affair.'
>
> Sri Pillalamarri Venkateswarulu raised a point of order whether such a reply based on the plea that it is an administrative affair was proper. The Speaker thereupon observed :
>
> 'When the Speaker has allowed a question every portion of it has to be answered by the Government. It is a question. The department could point out at that stage. When once the Speaker has decided to admit a question, nobody has a right to say that the admission is wrong and no answer will be given. So it should not be done by anybody. That I have to tell the Government also."

In view of this ruling, I would request the Hon'ble Speaker to revise his decision and ask the Government to answer clause (d) of Question No. 184 and place the documents, if any, received by them from the Central Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard the hon. Member Mr. Nagappa. I shall go into the authority quoted by the hon. Member and give a considered ruling to-morrow.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, with regard to held-over question I want to say something.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Will the hon. Member please respect the decision of the Chair ? I have already ruled that when the Question Hour is over even the held-over question cannot be put.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, you are shielding the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is wrong to say that the Chair is shielding the Government. I am not shielding any body.

Sri V. N. PATIL.—Sir, I want to know for whose fault I am being penalised ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I think the hon. Member is most uncharitable in saying that the Chair is shielding the Government. There is nothing of the type. The member should not be so uncharitable about it. After all I have given a ruling that this question cannot be raised for want of time. The matter should not be raised again. I have already said it cannot be done. The hon. Member may please obey the Chair and resume his seat.

Sri V. N PATIL.—I want you to reconsider your decision, Sir. I do not know what purpose would be served if the right of the Members are curtailed. If by curtailing the rights of hon. Members, the prestige of the House is going to be enhanced I have no objection. But the right of the members should not be curtailed for the sake of somebody. I strongly protest against the great injustice done in not permitting me to put the held-over question and I stage a walk-out.

(*Sri V. N. Patil withdrew*).

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—On a point of order, Sir. You just now said that a starred question can be converted into unstarred question. That is the Ruling of the Chair and I cannot question your ruling. At the same time, I would like to point out to you, Sir ; here is a position wherein a question was admitted by you as starred question, then it was also put on the list as starred question in the name of Sri V. N. Patil. The hon. Member also was permitted to put the question and yesterday he asked the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Everybody knows it.

Sri M. S. KRISHNAN.—When the question is asked, the Hon'ble Minister stated that he wants time to answer the supplementaries. In fairness to the hon. Member the concerned question should be permitted to be put the next day. It cannot lapse by virtue of lack of time. It cannot be converted into unstarred question. In the Rules of Procedure, I cannot find any rule which authorises the Speaker to convert a starred question into unstarred after all these stages are over.

(SRI M. S. KRISHNAN)

My humble suggestion is that the ruling may kindly be reconsidered and an opportunity given to the hon. Member although I cannot question your ruling.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA.—If you can bear with me for one minute. ಸ್ಪೀಮ್, ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಎನ್. ಪಾಟೀಲರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳೇ ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ನಾಳೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ದಿನ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾದು ಕುಳಿತಿದ್ದರು. ಈಗ ತಾವು ಸಮಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ರ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಯಿತು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರಿ. ತಾವು ಕೊಟ್ಟ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ನಾವುಗಳು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡುಬಿಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಆದರೆ ತಾವು ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಶ್ರೀ ಪಾಟೀಲರಿಗೆ ನಾಳೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ. ತಾವು ಈಗ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೆ ಪುನರ್ವಿಮರ್ಶೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ಭಾವನೆ.

MR. SPEAKER.—Nothing is added by the hon. Members who spoke just now and from what was said by Mr. Krishnan, I think the Chair's ruling was not properly appreciated. When a number of questions are put down for oral answers as starred questions for want of time, some questions are not answered. Some questions do remain and they go on record as unstarred questions in the sense that the questions and replies furnished will be printed in the proceedings of the House for that day. I never attempted to convert a starred question into unstarred question. It is only a matter of procedure that questions not actually taken up on any particular day will be printed along with answers in the day's proceedings. I said nothing more than that. Now there are 20 questions put down. I want to raise that number to 30 if the hon. Members co-operate. But with the best of co-operation available, if some questions cannot be taken up on the floor of the House for want of time, such questions and answers will be printed in the day's proceedings. The held over question of Sri V. N. Patil will be treated in the same manner. It should have been answered along with other questions. It was unfortunate that it was not reached. It does not mean that I am attempting to shield the Government and I am deliberately denying the opportunity to the Member. The hon. Member should be fair to the Chair.

With this, I think all this controversy is set at rest. I will take up the next item.

SRI S. BANGARAPPA —I am afraid we are creating a very bad precedent.

## Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers—Grant of leave to move.

MR. SPEAKER.—Yesterday three hon. Members, Sri H. M. Channabasappa and others have given notice of a no-confidence motion.

I shall take up the other motions later. I shall now call upon any one of the hon. Members who have given notice of the no-confidence motion, to ask for leave of the House to move the motion.

SRI S. SIVAPPA (Sravanabelagola).—I seek the leave of this House to move the motion of no-confidence against the Council of Ministers.

MR. SPEAKER.—The question is : I request hon. Members who are in favour of leave being granted to the motion to rise in their seats.

AN HON. MEMBER.—Two members on the Congress side are standing.

*(Counting was taken)*

MR. SPEAKER.—I am not concerned with it. Since more than 30 members have stood up, leave is granted to the hon. Member Sri Sivappa to move his motion.

I allot Tuesday for the consideration of this motion. So it will be taken up on Tuesday.

## Notice of adjournment Motion *re* : Hunger Strike in Gadag Town.

SRI K. H. PATIL.—I have given notice under Rule 50. Yesterday it was not received in the hands of the Secretary, well in time. Today I would like to impress upon the Chair and request that consent may be given to me to move the adjournment motion because it is very serious matter wherein the Municipal Administrator.....

1.30 P.M.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. Member Sri K. H. Patil has given notice of an adjournment motion. I have not made up my mind whether to give consent or not to give consent. Before considering the question of consent, I would request Sri Patil to explain why permission should be given to him to make the motion. While doing so, he should not go into the merits of the motion. I want him to enlighten me only on the following three aspects and nothing more :

Firstly, whether the question of hunger-strike can be an occasion for moving an adjournment motion. Secondly, from the wording of his notice, it appears that there are certain justiciable rights ; certain parties are claiming rights in a particular place and others are asserting their right of public way. Sri Patil should tell the House whether the House could be a forum for considering this matter when it falls within the jurisdiction of the civil courts and when it relates to civil rights. Thirdly, when the House is debating the Governor's Address, whether it is not open to the Member to raise this point also during the course of his speech.